

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference to Lalor (5,983,551). Claims 5-9, 13-15, 17-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalor in view of the reference to Sasaki (6,315,601). Claims 10-12, 21-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalor in view of the reference to Sasaki and further in view of the reference to Mattisson (6,104,238). The Examiner has indicated claims 16 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form incorporating the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants have canceled claims 16 and 25 and have rewritten those claims in independent form as claims 27 and 28. Applicants respectfully traverse Examiner's rejection of the remaining claims.

It is not understood how the Examiner interprets the Lalor reference since Lalor utilizes a set switch to select one of several preselected codes. The codes are not transmitted to the receiver by the transmitter but are merely selected at the receiver to recognize a predetermined code of a selected transmitter. In contrast, the present invention incorporates the ability of the receiver, when the "set" switch is activated, to establish recognition of the receiving circuit to signals only from an address, that is received while the switch is activated. Therefore, the receiving circuit subsequently only recognizes the address that was transmitted during the "set" switch actuation and stores this address. Subsequent received transmissions are then compared to its previously received and stored transmission, and, if recognized then operates on the

function code contained within the received signals. In contrast, Lalor merely previously selects a predetermined code and recognizes when that code is received.

With respect to claim 2, the comments made above with regard to claim 1 are appropriate. Further, with regard to claim 3, it is not seen how it would be obvious that the microcontroller would store the function code received from the transmitter prior to executing the code. In the present invention, the set switch is utilized to receive and store an address code and that address is stored. When the address received from subsequent transmissions matches, the function information accompanying the transmission is then executed. The same comments can be made with regard to claim 4. The utilization of sound algorithms stored in the microcontroller are functional only when the previously transmitted and stored address is recognized in response to the actuation of the “set” switch.

Claims 5 - 19 recite variations of a test circuit responsive to a test switch for testing the continuity of the coupling by the coupling device. The Lalor reference does not disclose such a test circuit. Further, it is not seen how the disclosure in the reference to Sasaki et al. can be combined with Lalor. Sasaki is directed to a simple connector and there is no suggestion or teaching in Lalor or Sasaki that would combine the two in any manner that would provide the function or structure recited in the claims of the present application. The utilization of the test circuit as claimed provides important information to the operator concerning the essential continuity of the coupling provided by the equipment. Reference to a “double lock connector” does not include a suggestion for incorporating the testing of continuity in the system of the

present invention.

The arguments set forth above concerning the continuity testing of the coupling applies to claims 20 - 26. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure to Sasaki fails to suggest utilization of continuity testing incorporated in an the animal training device or method as set forth in applicants' claims.

The addition of the reference to Mattisson again does not provide the combination of steps or apparatus set forth in applicants' claims. The FM demodulation technique described by Mattisson is generally directed to filter and detector demodulation techniques; however, there is no suggestion in Mattisson to implement any such techniques in an animal training device or method and combine such demodulating technique in an animal training device or method combined with other elements or steps. The invention resides in the combination of these elements and does not rely upon the particular FM demodulation technique that may be described by Mattisson. There is no teaching or suggestion in Mattisson, or in any of the cited references that they can be combined to provide the combination that is recited in the respective claims.

Applicants appreciatively note the allowability of claims 16 and 25 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants have canceled claims 16 and 25 and replaced those claims with newly submitted claims 27 and 28 replacing claim 16 and 25 respectively, and rewritten in independent

form including the limitations of the respective base claims and intervening claims.

In view of the above amendment and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is presently in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CAHILL, VON HELLENS & GLAZER P.L.C.



William C. Cahill
Registration No. 19,742

2141 East Highland Avenue
155 Park One
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
(602) 956-7000
Docket No. 2973-A-30